



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE INSPIRATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT
INDUCTIVELY CONSIDERED.*

By Rev. HENRY A. ROGERS,

Worcester, Mass.

Principal Cave is a conservative. He is not a novice. Volumes and articles from his pen, on subjects kindred to this one, for more than a decade past, have been indicating the lines of his research. His "*Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice*," appearing in 1877, in thought and statement clear, vigorous and for the most part convincing, while fascinating as Fairbairn's Typology, has made welcome his subsequent productions. Such articles as "The Critical Estimate of Mosaism," of the same year, in *The Princeton Review*, "On the Latest Phase of the Pentateuch Question," and "Professor Robertson Smith and the Pentateuch," in *The British and Foreign Evangelical Review* of 1880, "The Old Testament in the Jewish Church," in the same Review the next year, his introduction to *The Pulpit Commentary on Leviticus*, and the tract, "When was the Pentateuch Written?" show that the present work is not so much the product of a few months' study as the growth of years. Indeed, from the very scope of the argument in the book, and the consequent far-reaching and time-consuming induction of supporting facts of tradition, science, ethnology and biblical doctrine and criticism, it is plain that the author did not go to school simply in Jonah's booth. He has taken time to do a noble and lasting work. And he has done his work at an opportune time.

The aim of the author is the maintenance of "The Supremacy of the Bible as Revelation, all Revelation implying Inspiration,"—a statement of theme not without slight clumsiness. This work is the seventh lecture of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, an earlier lecture of the series being on *The Supremacy of Scripture as Literature* by that great lover of the literature of the Bible, Henry Rogers,

* By Alfred Cave, B.A., Principal of Hackney College. London: *Congregational Union of England and Wales*, Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, 1888.

the author of that delightful book, *The Superhuman Origin of the Bible inferred from Itself*. This theme of the earlier lecture doubtless determined somewhat the form of the theme of the later one. Mr. Cave is not a clumsy or an ungraceful writer. Neither is the style obscure, but easily intelligible and forceful and logical.

He thinks that he sees, as a result of the Socinian and Deistic and Rationalistic controversies of the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and more especially of the attacks by the peculiar weapons of philosophy, "higher criticism" and physical science, during the present century, a less rugged loyalty to the supremacy of Scripture as revelation, than at the opening of the Reformation and at the period of the first Helvetic Confession. This result, together with the current "fluidity of opinion" and vagueness of "all deliberate statements concerning inspiration," it is his purpose in this treatise to withstand. But to the Old Testament, as the present battle-field and key to the whole controversy, and for other reasons, he limits his investigations.

As to the method of the author no one needs to be told, after learning that he is conservative. As such he humbly chooses, as best becomes the conservative to do, the now prevalent method. He must. Agnosticism is the master of ceremonies and of arguments. Why should anybody know anything, least of all about that which is long established and well settled? The man that has an opinion cannot sit on the jury. He is "traditional." What will become of him then in such a plight? Somebody is sure to be "surprised." Better take the inductive inquiry and be safe. Perhaps Wellhausen need not adopt the inductive method, but may cherish opinions and express them. Possibly Piepenbring in his *Theology of the Old Testament* may have views and support them by arguments. These men are not "traditionalists." They are safe enough. They will not "surprise" anybody. But such authors as Basil Manly, in his *Biblical Doctrine of Inspiration*, and Alfred Cave must go into the jury box. So the method is submissively ostensibly inductive.

But it is not uniformly and consistently so. That was a frightful line of battle—those brave asses that the ancient king drew up, all arrayed in lions' pelts. Not a little amusing was it when in the jostling of the battle their ears began

to show out. Conversely, scarcely less amusing is it, when our author, long time and well known champion in many public places for the early origin of the Pentateuch, unwisely draws on the meek hide of the harmless beast, but in the heat of debate lets flash from out its mock demureness the fierce, far-seeing eye and the kingly roar of the lion. But even this feature of the work is farther from a fault than from a foible. Godet's otherwise excellent commentaries lose nothing, but gain much of zest and interest, by his interjected paragraphs of black-faced type, like passing storm-clouds, full of fire, flashing down upon the advanced criticism his lightning wit and argument and ridicule. Peter did not get on well as a *pro tem.* ruffian. Alfred Cave in his inductive role has not escaped the bewraying of his speech.

In pursuing his method the author begins with the examination of certain data which he classifies under the head of "Genesis and Ethnic Tradition." More accurately, the first twelve chapters of Genesis are compared with the ethnic traditions of the flood, of creation, including man and woman, of the Garden of Eden, of the serpent, the Fall, and of the number of patriarchs before the flood.

In the Genesis he finds a story of a flood. Among the traditions of almost all peoples of the earth and of all the races of mankind, save the black race, he finds similar traditions. Among "the Babylonians and the races of India; the Egyptians, the Phœnicians and the Syrians; the Greeks, the Etruscans and the Romans; the Celts, the Scandinavians and the Lithuanians; the native tribes of North America, and the inhabitants of America south of the Isthmus of Panama; the Chinese, the Japanese, and the inhabitants of Borneo; and even among the savages of Polynesia." From these facts it is inferred, and not without reason, that the origin of the flood-story of Genesis and of the flood-stories of the nations antedates the dispersion of the race from its central home after the flood. The traditions, not being derived from Genesis, corroborate Genesis.

In like manner, though not with so great fullness of treatment and quotation, other corroborative traditions are traced among the nations. Other peoples, as well as the Hebrews, teach that "the world was created in six days, that man was formed of the dust of the ground, that woman was moulded

from man, that humanity has sprung from a single pair, that the primitive beliefs of men were monotheistic." Not the Hebrew only has his primitive paradise, but the Egyptian also, and the Brahman, and the Scandinavian. Hesiod sang of the Golden Age when there was no labor and no death and no old age. The Aztec priest chants of the land of plenty and of peace where God dwelt. The author finds also that art has aided memory in embalming primitive universal traditions, as the ancient Babylonian cylinder in the British Museum, upon which is represented a man and a woman seated under large overhanging fruits, and a serpent standing by the woman's side; as "the central tablet of a large sculpture in the temple of Osiris at Phylæ," upon which is wrought every particular and feature of the temptation, and differing from the former representation in the fruit being already in the hands of the man and woman; as a bas-relief of pre-christian times in a wall at Rome showing a man and woman standing under a tree of fruit with a serpent entwined about its trunk. India and Mexico have similar representations, and still other peoples, corroborative traditions of the fall, and of many other facts recorded in the first twelve chapters of Genesis. "In short," concludes the writer, "in view of the multitudinous fragments dispersed in many lands, the conclusion is inevitable that some of the religious traditions extant are lovingly cherished remains of a primitive system of belief, heirlooms, more or less decayed, from the days when the race occupied a common home and held a common faith."

From this first inference that the traditions both of Genesis and of the nations are primeval, the argument proceeds to the position that the traditions preserved in Genesis are original, not derived from, because more full, better ordered, less extravagant than, the ethnic traditions; not the source of them as held by Gale in his *Court of the Gentiles*, because what is common to them and Genesis ends at the dispersion; not parallel with them in mythical origin, because it is incredible that from so many different and dissimilar nations, so many myths, so identical in form and detail as those of the tree of life, and the number of the patriarchs, and the salvation of one family from the deluge, and the three founders of the race after Noah, should arise, but rather that to each

early religion these traditions were original, being derived from the one primeval source. And if the accounts in the early chapters of Genesis are original they must be also of the highest antiquity. In comparison with the ethnic traditions they are seen to be pure. Being primitive, original, ancient and pure, they are historical. This then is the result of the comparison of these chapters of Genesis with the ethnic traditions, that they are "history, not legend,—narrative, not allegory,—prose not poetry."

A second series of facts are considered under the head of "Genesis and Science." Here is an ancient record called Genesis and purporting to be historical, which in its wide scope of statement incidentally trenches on the field of science. Does science confirm these statements or deny them? Genesis says that Eve "was the mother of all living." What says science of the unity of the race? Baron Cuvier early in this century affirmed that the family of mankind are of "one common origin." Mr. Darwin prophesied before his death "that before long the dispute between the monogenists and polygenists will die a silent and unobtrusive death." And Dr. E. B. Tylor in his article on Anthropology in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* says that "on the whole, it may be asserted that the doctrine of the unity of mankind now stands on a firmer basis than in any previous age." How much our late war, the war of the rebellion, and its issues have contributed toward this scientific inference, we may not be able exactly to compute, but that the results of that great contest are more than political and social cannot be doubted. Certainly what we may justly call the great American experiment, already continued over four hundred years, of combining into one all the races of the earth, is yielding scientific results. The fruits of intermarriage are not sterility or imbecility. Rather, as the races approach unity by amalgamation both physical and mental endowments are advanced. The primeval record of Genesis is, therefore, in this case, confirmed by the modern inferences of Science.

Again the Babel story implies the original unity of language. Almost from the beginning of the science of philology only three classes of languages were named. It will not be deemed venturesome, at this date, to say that each step in

the advance of comparative philology is toward a primitive language of original roots, from which all others have been derived. The history of Genesis is accordingly the inference of philology.

Turning to ethnography, the historical character of Genesis receives still greater confirmation. The tenth chapter boldly sets forth the origin, locality, and growth of the primitive nations, in great detail. It renders itself specially liable to contradiction, if not true. And it bears within itself the marks of high antiquity, by the conspicuous omission of great later facts in the history of Noah's descendants. Noah has three sons, each the head of a race. From the flood the current of human life flows abroad in three channels. Is this biblical statement historical and scientific? What says Cuvier? "Caucasian, Mongolian, Ethiopian." What says Prichard? "According to skull formation, the Oval, the Pyramidal, and the Prognathous." What says Latham? "The Atlantidæ, the Japetidæ, and the Mongolidæ." And Max Müller? "The Aryan, Semitic and Turanian." And Hamilton Smith? "The Bearded, Beardless and Wooly Type." Neither at this point should it be forgotten that to each one of the three races of science, belongs its own one of the three classes of languages, nor that ancient Iran, to which noted region of the earth ethnography traces the primitive home of the human family, is the same geographically as the plain of Shinar, the diverging point and distributing center of the Genesis history. Thus the opinions of scientific men have come after centuries, and against inveterate prejudices, to concur with the biblical statement, on the genealogy of races.

To modern theological science also Principal Cave directs his inquiries. At this stage of the investigation, leaving out of mind all claim of inspiration and of revealed religion, he raises the question whether the common facts of the religious life of men are in agreement with the assumptions and positions of Genesis regarded as merely historical. Genesis assumes the unity of Deity. Natural theology answers that there are not gods or creators, but one Creator. Genesis declares that the world was created. Not even Darwin attempted to account for the three or four primordial germs of animal life. Genesis teaches that God is ever near his

works, upholding and directing by his government. Not less dominant in the breast of mankind is the sense of dependence upon a higher power than is the causal judgment. Indeed they are twin instincts of the human soul, accounted for in these forceful words of our author: "Creation implies a new divine resolve as well as a divine working. Conservation means a continuance of the divine working, upon the same resolve." Genesis pictures the introduction of evil into the world and its appalling prevalence. Does not human experience witness to the same, and by its unrest and longing imply a loss of which it is not distinctly conscious, and compel a belief in a moral ideal which it is now unable to realize? Certainly what Genesis narrates as fact on the ingress of evil finds a wonderful parallel in human experience.

No one would expect an inductive inquiry into the concurrent relations of Genesis and science without a full consideration of the narrative of creation and the science theories of cosmogony. Mr. Cave's discussion of this part of his subject is ample and careful. He does not claim too much. Neither does he fail to point out many striking coincidences. The series of parallels in the two records, of the succession of life, and even according to the speculative nebular hypothesis of Laplace, of progressive cosmic order, are so arranged as greatly to enhance the weight of the argument from science for the historicity of Genesis.

Thus to whatever science appeal is made the response is returned that Genesis is historical and trustworthy so far as that science furnishes a test. What is the original source of this trustworthy history science does not declare. But it does declare, especially in the creation narrative, that such history, antedating the advent of man, cannot be of exclusively human authority.

Having thus determined the historical character of so much of Genesis, the question is immediately raised, Who then wrote the book and when was it written? Even if these results reached are not admitted, this is an interesting question. For if the confirmations of science do not render Genesis historical, this remarkable concurrence must be accounted for. And if Genesis is historical, then the later its date "the greater is the evidence for supernatural revelation."

Pursuing under this inquiry the same method as before, the author first turns aside to give a brief sketch of the history of "Higher Criticism," in order that the reader may follow more intelligently the course of argument. For as he very truthfully says, "Such a book, for instance, as Dr. Kuenen's *Religion of Israel*, or such an article as Dr. Wellhausen's article on 'Israel' in the current edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* cannot but appear to the English reader a tissue of baseless assumptions, unless he has previously acquainted himself with the course of recent criticism upon the Pentateuch." How such works appear to those who have given some attention to the subject, he modestly does not say.

He dates the "critical movement" to the work of the Roman Catholic French physician, Jean Astruc, 1753, who conjectured only that Moses had compiled Genesis from two principal documents characterized respectively by the two Hebrew words for God. The German Eichhorn caught up the suggestion and making use of the same methods of historical and literary criticism, then in vogue in Germany, as applied to classical story, brought them to bear upon the entire Pentateuch, with the result of the first phase of the Higher Criticism known as the Earlier Documentary theory, which regarded the whole of Genesis and the earlier part of Exodus as compiled mainly from two original sources, distinguished by the divine name and other critical marks.

This first phase was soon followed by a second, called the New-Edition theory, characterized by embracing the first six books of the Bible, by separating Deuteronomy from the rest as an independent document, and by making the Jehovist, who may or may not have been the author of Deuteronomy, living not earlier than David, edit the original Elohist document, which could not have been written earlier than the time of the Judges, adding to it at pleasure either by his own composition, or from tradition or other records at his command.

It took a hundred years for the wheel of criticism to grind out this grist, and it still kept turning. And to mix the figure a little, next turned up the Later Documentary theory. Hupfeld in 1853 found one author preferring the name Elohim for God, a second and third preferring Jehovah, a fourth, who wrote Deuteronomy, and a fifth, who combined all these inde-

pendent documents into one, "using, however, a large editorial liberty of alteration." But the leading critics, as Ewald, Knobel, Dillmann, Samuel Davidson and others, said "Hupfeld is Ephraim, 'a cake not turned.' Two independent Jehovahists are too many plums in our pudding." So this theory matured into the view of one Elohist document written by a priest about the time of David, one Jehovahist document, containing extracts from another Jehovahist, and written by a prophetic Ephraimite, two hundred years later, and the Deuteronomy written a little earlier than the reign of Josiah, all edited by an author, who, if he was not himself the author of Deuteronomy, must have been later than the seventh century before Christ.

But still a fourth, More Elaborate Compilation theory appears. Here is something new indeed. The Elohist is no longer the earliest writer of all, but the latest, contemporary with Ezekiel. Deuteronomy is written about the time of Josiah. The Jehovahist is earlier, but after the division of the kingdom of Solomon, having gathered into written form, for the first time, the oral and variable ancient traditions, and having included the most ancient document of the twentieth, twenty-first, -second and -third and thirty-fourth chapters of Genesis. These all were compiled after the Babylonian exile about 450 years B.C. This theory our author quotes Dr. Kuenen as calling "the received view of European critical scholarship."

But now last of all a fifth phase is looming up. The preceding order of the documents is maintained, but Deuteronomy is now discovered to be, not, as has been all along by all supposed, an original homogeneous work, but, like all the others, compiled from many sources, and at least two hundred years later, in the fifth, or may be the fourth, century B.C. The Priest's Code, the Elohist document, is also post-exilic and still later than Deuteronomy. Even the Jehovahistic prophetic piece, though earlier than Deuteronomy, cannot be earlier than the Exile. Such are the trend and the residuum of the history of the Higher Criticism. One feature is specially noticeable. Whoever the author, and whatever the date of the Pentateuch, all the books that compose it are assigned to one period. It is homogeneous. This is the testimony of Criticism.

But returning now to the one book of Genesis, what does a careful examination of its contents determine, as to its date of composition, its simple or composite construction, and its authorship?

First of all here are expressions which seem to some to imply the possession of knowledge impossible in the days of Moses, apparent anachronisms, as in the twelfth chapter, sixth verse: "And the Canaanite was then in the land;" the thirteenth chapter, seventh verse: "And the Canaanite and the Perizzite dwelled then in the land;" thirty-sixth, thirty-first: "Before there reigned any king over the children of Israel," and such like. But do these necessarily imply that the opposite was true at the time of the writing? By no means. Not one of them but is susceptible of another explanation. And a hundred possibles can scarcely make one probable. Besides, such an implication entirely ignores the far greater probability of the inspired interpretation and revision of these ancient books of the Pentateuch by Ezra, who is called "a ready scribe in the Law of Moses," and is described as having "prepared his heart to seek the law of the Lord, and to do it, and to teach in Israel statutes and judgments" and "the law of his God to such as knew it not."

But even if there were no such natural and sufficient explanations of the few apparent anachronisms, the counter evidence of abundant and manifest scientific and contemporaneous knowledge would leave them little weight in favor of a later authorship of Genesis. Nothing conclusive is found in Genesis determining its late date.

What, next, is the evidence offered by Genesis itself upon its simple or composite authorship? We have already noticed particular sections of the book marked by their respective use of the name of God. It is also claimed that the Elohist sections bear a style so different from the Jehovistic sections as to warrant a belief that they could not have been the product of the same mind. Third, that this difference of style extends to the use of words. And fourth, that there are parallel accounts of the same facts that are contradictory.

While from these data Principal Cave finds no actual contradictions, he does conclude that "the work of at least two hands has become evident, an Elohist and a Jehovist. For, besides the methodical employment of the names of Elohim

and Jehovah for the deity, other data declare for at least a duality of authorship, viz: the great differences of style characteristic of the sections where the name Elohim alone occurs as contrasted with those sections in which the name Jehovah is prominent, a difference of style so radical as to argue diversity of historical and theological stand-point as well as variation in vocabulary and diction."

But how firm are the grounds of this judgment? Let us call to mind the historical fact that Astruc, in the beginning, broached the conjecture of two authors of Genesis, upon the ground of the discriminating use of the divine names. That was his only basis. Principal Cave himself tells us that Eichhorn saw at once that the use of the names alone was not a sufficiently broad critical basis for a theory of dual authorship, and so "combined Astruc's suggestion with the critical methods already used in classical history." Prof. Bissell, in his well-known work, *The Pentateuch, its Origin and Structure*, says that "It is an acknowledged impossibility, in fact, to found a rational theory of separable documents on the use of the divine names as they now appear in Genesis." Our author himself accords with this opinion, and speaks of "the comparatively coarse test of the divine names." Is it really a fact, then, that two divine names in one book do not prove two authors of that book? Is it true that nobody relies upon this argument as decisive, or ever has relied upon it? It is true that the critics all hasten to their sweet solace of "the more subtle critical methods" which, they are careful, every one, to tell us, as Principal Cave also does, are not fully appreciated but by those who are very learned in the Hebrew language and literature. But the eminent Dutch critic, Dr. Kuenen, is bold to say, in speaking of the date of Genesis, what must be as true also of the authorship, for the two cannot be separated, that "the facts we have to go upon are comparatively few and are often ambiguous; and sometimes, too, it is doubtful whether the evidence refers to the original narratives themselves or to the more or less modified form in which they have come down to us. We must therefore," he continues, "be content, when the circumstances require it, with a more or less vague result." Take now even Principal Cave's argument for two authors from the use of words: "It is difficult, it is true," he says, "to convey the force of this linguistic evi-

dence to those who know no Hebrew ; nevertheless, a few instances in point may give a little faint insight into the conclusive nature of the evidence. In comparing, for example, the Elohist and Jehovistic narratives of the creation, the following peculiarities are found." How faint insight into how conclusive evidence just let us notice. "The Elohist speaks of 'the living thing of the earth,' and the Jehovist of 'the living thing of the field.' The Elohist speaks of 'grass' and 'herb' and 'tree,' and the Jehovist speaks of 'plant.' The Elohist speaks of 'the herb of the earth,' and the Jehovist of 'the herb of the field.' The Elohist affects the term 'earth,' and the Jehovist prefers the term 'soil.'" This is a specimen. Truly the "conclusive evidence" that there must have been two writers of these parallel accounts to use these two sets of words and that one man could not possibly have chosen to express himself in a variety of form, or writing at different stages of mental and literary progress, or for different purposes, or in different moods, would not naturally have used different terms, is, indeed, both "little" and "faint." And yet this is the sort of evidence that has been relied on to establish the momentous proposition of a dual authorship of Genesis! Not that any one fact, or any one line of evidence is conclusive or is claimed to be conclusive, but that the immeasurable multiplicity of these unwelded and unconnected links must somehow make a chain. One hundred and forty-four barely possibles make one square probable, and nine square probables make one square certitude, and twenty-seven and one-half square certitudes, one rock-bed acre upon which dual authorship can stand and never be driven therefrom. And yet we already hear Principal Cave say that "the evidence mainly relied upon to-day by the advocates of the evolution theory, 'the received view of European scholarship,' as Kuenen says, is of a historical and not a literary kind," that "comparatively little is heard of divergencies in phraseology, seeming anachronisms, dual or triple or multiple repetitions of narrative, apparent contradictions and all the paraphernalia of literary criticism," that "the conflict concerning authorship has been transferred from the arena of literary to that of historical criticism," that "the minutiae of literary criticism" are "the most uncertain of weapons," and that

"Wellhausen was quite right when he said, that, in all this by-play of literary criticism, 'the firemen never came near the spot where the conflagration was raging,'" and that "it is only within the region of religious antiquities and dominant religious ideas that the controversy can be brought to a definite issue." Where, then, upon the critics' own estimate of the weight of the evidence is the substantial ground of even the two-document theory of the composition of Genesis?

It is but right, however, to say of our author that when he comes to the question of a theory of the authorship of Genesis, upon its own data, he finds Moses to be the Jehovist, who, while utilizing the pre-existing material brought together by the Elohist, himself gives substantial form to the book, which book bears "traces of a post-Mosaic revision of a very respectful and conservative nature." It is true, also, that he holds the theory of two authors so loosely as to suggest what is probably the most comprehensive solution of all the facts, viz: that Moses is both Jehovist and Elohist. Moses did use one name of Deity until a certain period, when he did use another, and have a sufficient reason for the change. It would be natural for the young man, at "the backside of the desert," in view of Horeb, in years of repose, and with time for reflection, and under the gathering sense of the holy Presence, to adopt one style of literary composition, and use one terminology, and have one religious stand-point, and after his crucial experiences at the burning-bush and in Egypt, that the old warrior statesman at the head of the wilderness marches, and specially in the disappointed, hastening, shortened days under the shadow of Nebo, should express himself in quite a different manner. Should we not expect from the one period a treatise and from the other a journal? Prof. Harper in *Hebraica* characterizes the style of the priestly writer, the Elohist, as "(1) systematic (perhaps artificial) in arrangement of material, (2) chronological, statistical, perhaps mechanical, (3) minute, precise, scientific, (4) rigid, stereotyped, condensed." Are not these the marks of earlier not to say youthful composition? He also says that the style of the Jehovist is "(1) free and flowing, (2) characterized by an abundance of stories and traditions, (3) picturesque, poetical, (4) prophetic in the proper sense of the word, viz: as furnishing religious instruction." These certainly are the marks of a maturer age and experience, without appeal to Cicero's authority.

But so simple an explanation of variable style in Genesis as this will of course only "surprise" those critics whose literary acumen is so cultivated as to be able to assign the first part of the sixteenth verse of the seventh chapter of Genesis, "And they that went in, went in male and female of all flesh, as God had commanded him," to the priestly writer, P; the last part, "And the Lord shut him in," to the prophetic writer, J; the first line of the next verse, "And the flood was forty days upon the earth," to the later editor or reviser, R; the next sentence, "And the waters increased, and bare up the ark, and it was lift up above the earth," to J again, and the following to P and so on. Such discriminating literary insight comes naturally to some. The weight and worth of it become apparent when we learn that two leading critics thus endowed assign all of R's part, "And the flood was forty days upon the earth," to P except the two words "forty days," thus robbing R to pay P, while Dillmann takes it all away from R and gives it to J. We are sorry that our more deliberate and critical judgment will not sustain Dillmann. But the witnesses are two to one. And there is something so remarkably changeable about the Hebrew numeral "forty," and the Hebrew word "days," that these two experts in Higher Criticism must have seen some literary feature or theological bias about these nimble words warranting their assignment to R, of a somewhat later period than P or J.

Having now concluded that Genesis is a reliable history, having received its substantial form from Moses, the author by a similar inductive process of reasoning finds that the rest of the Pentateuch also is by the hand of Moses, written as a historical journal, and that the entire Pentateuch being credible as history is also credible as a history of revelation. It is, therefore, because "human knowledge of revelation implies inspiration," of divine origin. The law contained therein is inspired of God. The inspiration of the prophetic books is found chiefly in their predictive character, and of the Hagiographa, in their predictions and in the unity of the entire Old Testament. The Old Testament is defined to be not only a record of revelation and of inspired revelation, but of a course of inspired revelation. "Revelation is divine knowledge divinely imparted" and "inspiration is a co-operation of the

Holy Ghost with the spirit of man, guaranteeing the reliability of the record." That the record is absolutely devoid of mistakes the author makes no claim to know, but that "it is substantially true, is veracious, trustworthy and historical," the inquiry throughout abundantly maintains.

THE VALUE OF EGYPTOLOGICAL STUDY.

By F. C. H. WENDEL, Ph.D.,

New York City.

So much has been done abroad of late years in Egyptology, that it may be well briefly to sketch the history of this science and to call the attention of theologians and historians to the value of Egyptological study.

While Egypt was still a great power, while its beautiful tongue was still living in the mouths of its people and was still cut into the stone and writ on the papyrus, no attempt was made by the neighboring peoples to learn the Egyptian language. The acquisition of foreign languages was not a practice of the ancients. The Greeks, who were the most intellectual race that came into contact with the Egyptians at a time when the old tongue was still spoken, contented themselves with appropriating what of science and art they found useful to themselves. The Phenicians, who had come into contact with Egypt long before the Greeks, while they appropriated the art and alphabet of Egypt, yet were a purely commercial people, little inclined to philological studies. Thus it happened that it was not until after the old tongue had been dead for centuries that *Horapollon* made the first futile attempt to decipher the old monuments. In the middle ages the study was again taken up; men like Athanasius Kircher applied themselves to it, but they met with no success. Their great mistake was that they looked upon the hieroglyphs as so many riddles that must be guessed. The nonsense they read out of the old monuments greatly discredited the new science and scholars turned to the Coptic, which